

## REMARKS

By the foregoing amendment, the specification has been amended to conform the figure numbers with the Brief Description of the Drawings as amended September 25, 2003, and Claim 22 has been amended. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 22-29, and 31-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) on the grounds of anticipation by Shoemaker et al., as in the Office Action of June 2, 2005. In the amendment of July 29, 2005, Claim 22 was amended to change "and for storage" to read "and to be rolled for storage." In the Advisory Action of September 21, 2005, the Examiner indicated that this amendment required "a new consideration and search for the newly cited feature," yet the Office Action has not addressed the feature of being rolled, and the Examiner has not cited any prior art as disclosing this feature.

In the Examiner's Response to Arguments/Amendment, in paragraph 2 of the Office Action, it appears that this was intended to substantially copy the language from page 3, lines 3 to the end, of the Office Action of June 2, 2005, and only discusses the language of the claims prior to the amendment of July 25, 2005. The current Office Action simply has not addressed the claims as amended in the amendment of July 25, 2005.

The Examiner indicated that the prior art allows for a mask to be deflected "for storage," which could be any position or orientation in which the mask is ever so slightly deflected. However, Claim 22 was amended to recite the orientation of being rolled for storage.

In order to advance the examination of the application, by the foregoing amendment, Claim 22 has been amended to recite "said flexible optical lens having a rolled configuration for storage and an unrolled configuration capable of deflecting to conform to a wearer's face and to said rolled configuration," in order to clarify the nature of the position and orientation of the storage configuration of the mask as being rolled, as opposed to the configuration suggested by the Examiner of being "ever so slightly deflected." Support for the feature that the flexible optical lens of the invention has a rolled configuration for storage can be found in the specification at page 4, lines 29-35; page 7, lines 25-29; page 9, lines 9-14, and in Fig. 3.

Shoemaker et al. discloses at column 4, lines 25-42, that the "Mask 10 is molded of a transparent silicone elastomer in a thickness sufficient to make it semi-rigid .... to retain its open shape shown in FIG. 1 but with enough resiliency to deflect under urging by optical eyepieces." It is respectfully submitted that Shoemaker et al. does not teach, disclose or suggest a full face oxygen mask that includes a flexible optical lens having a rolled configuration for storage of the mask, as is claimed. Shoemaker et al. teaches at column 2, lines 10-12, that its protective mask is molded in the open condition so that donning is simplified and speeded up, and teaches at column 4, lines 43-53, that its protective mask is prepared for stowage by pulling the head straps and head pad forward over the visor, so that the mask can be pulled from stowage and clapped against a wearer's face, after which the straps can be placed into position on the wearer's head. Since rolling of the protective mask of Shoemaker et al. would place the straps rearward, instead of forward, as is prescribed in Shoemaker et al., it is respectfully submitted that

Shoemaker et al. clearly teaches away from providing a protective mask with a rolled configuration. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claims 22-29, and 31-34 are novel and inventive over Shoemaker et al., and that the rejection of Claims 22-29, and 31-34 on the grounds of anticipation by Shoemaker et al. should be withdrawn.

Claim 30 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) on the grounds of obviousness from Shoemaker et al. in view of Aulgur et al. or Dubruille et al., which were cited as teaching use of an inflatable harness formed of silicone tubing. However, as noted above, it is respectfully submitted that Shoemaker et al., Aulgur et al. and Dubruille et al. do not teach, disclose or suggest a full face oxygen mask that includes a flexible optical lens having a rolled configuration for storage of the mask, as is claimed. It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claim 30 is novel and inventive over Shoemaker et al., Aulgur et al., and Dubruille et al., taken individually or in combination, and that the rejection of Claim 30 on the grounds of obviousness from Shoemaker et al. in view of Aulgur et al. or Dubruille et al. should be withdrawn.

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application should now be in condition for allowance, and an early favorable action in this regard is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FULWIDER PATTON LLP

By:

James W. Paul

Registration No. 29,967

JWP:rvw

Encl.: Return Postcard

Howard Hughes Center  
6060 Center Drive, Tenth Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90045  
Telephone: (310) 824-5555  
Facsimile: (310) 824-9696  
Customer No. 24201  
113047.1